



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,273	10/26/2001	Douglas Andrew White	IRI05426	9994
23330	7590	09/02/2005	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC. LAW DEPARTMENT 1303 E. ALGONQUIN ROAD SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			LIOU, JONATHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2663	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

A

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/014,273	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WHITE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jonathan Liou	<b>Art Unit</b> 2663	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. The following title is suggested: IP Address Allocation For Mobile Terminals
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
3. The server 41 on line 35 of page 3, and line 3 and 6 of page 4 does not show on the Fig.2 of the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Objections*

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 4 of claim 1 "for" should be changed to "from". Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claim 1, 9, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,687,252 to Bertrand et al.

7. As per claim 1 and 9, Bertrand et al. disclose a method for Internet protocol (IP) address allocating (**Fig. 1, IP address allocating diagram.**) in a mobile networking system (**co 2, lines 20-25**), comprising the step of:

Requesting by a mobile station an activation for a unique IP address from an external network (**MT sends the activation PDP context request, which could be interpreted as a unique IP address as claimed, and the request is sent to server, which could be interpreted as a the external network as claimed. See Fig. 1 and col 2, lines 20-40.**)

Statefully obtaining by a network the unique IP address from the external network (**GGSN receives the unique IP address from the server, and the SGSN and GGSN are considered a network as claimed and server are considered as external network as claimed. See step 26 in Fig. 1, col 2, lines 37-40, and col 5, lines 61-67.**)

Transmitting the unique IP address by the network to the mobile station (**step 28 in Fig. 1, and col 2, lines 37-40.**)

8. As per claim 9, Since Bertrand et al. teach a method of allocating an IP address with an example of mobile networking system (**Fig. 1 and col 2, lines 20-25, Bertrand et al.**); hence, the same basis and rationale for claim rejection as applied to claim 1 above are applied to claim 9.

9. As per claim 17, Bertrand et al. disclose a network method for allocating a unique IP address (**Fig. 1, IP address allocating diagram.**) comprising the step of:

Receiving a request for a unique IP address (**PDP Context request is received by SGSN and GGSN, which are located in the network. See Fig. 1)**

Then, the same basis and rationale for claim rejection as applied to claim 1 above are applied to the remainder of claim 17.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,687,252 to Bertrand et al., and in view of DHCP for IPv6 to Charles E. Perkins and Jim Bound.

12. As per claims 2-3, Bertrand et al. teach a method for IP address allocation and also teach the step of statefully obtaining (see the claim 1 rejection above in the office action.) They do not specifically teaching the step of soliciting by the network access to an address server within the external network and sending by the address server an advertisement message to the network as claimed.

Nevertheless, Bertrand et al. teach a DHCP server may be queried for the IP address instead the Radius Access server as the example disclosed in Bertrand et al's reference (see col 6, lines 38-39, Bertrand et al.), and J. Bound and C. Perkins teach

DHCP system includes the client multicasts a DHCP solicit from the interface which it wished to configure, and wait for a DHCP advertise message back from the server (see sec 2.2 in page 1, C Perkins and J. Bound.) Since GGSN is interfaced with DHCP server (see Fig. 1, Bertrand et al.), GGSN could solicit the network access to an server, which is within the external network as claimed, and sending an advertisement message by the server to the GGSN, which is located in the network system as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the step of soliciting by the network access and sending by the address server based on Bertrand et al.'s method in view of C. Perkins and J. Bound's teaching because this would provide the advantage for the network to select the unique IP address after receiving advertisement from the server. Moreover, Bertrand et al. do teach using DHCP server may be queried for the IP address (see col 6, lines 38-39, Bertrand et al.)

13. As per claim 4, C. Perkins and J. Bound teach the advertisement message as taught in claim 3 rejection above in the office action. Bertrand et al. teach requesting by the network the unique IP address via an address request message (SGSN sends PDP Context request and GGSN sends the requests for the unique IP address from the server via radius access accept message 26. See Fig. 1, col 2, lines 30-34, and col 5, lines 52-67.)

14. As per claim 5, Bertrand et al. teach address request message as taught for claim rejection 4 above. They also teach assigning the unique IP address to the network for use by the mobile station recited in claim 5 (the response from the server

including an IP address for the mobile terminal is received in the GGSN. See Fig. 1 and col 2, lines 37-40, and col 5, lines 60-67, Bertrand et al.)

15. As per claim 6, Bertrand et al. teach performing a duplicate address detection procedure by the network on the unique IP address to insure uniqueness of the unique IP address (GGSN is considered as the network system. GGSN filters ensure the same IP address is not assigned to more than one MT. See Col 7, lines 27-45, and Fig. 3, Bertrand et al.)

16. As per claim 7, Bertrand et al. teach sending by the network the unique IP address to mobile station (see Fig. 1, step 27 and 28, Bertrand et al.)

17. As per claim 8, Bertrand et al. teach sending by the network an address prefix of the external network to the mobile station (An address is transmitted from the server, which could be the external network as claimed and sending the prefix from SSGN, which is located in the network as claimed, to the mobile station. See col 6-7, lines 63-4 and Fig. 2, Bertrand et al.)

18. As per claims 10-16, Since Bertrand et al. teach a method of allocating an IP address with a example of mobile networking system (Fig. 1 and col 2, lines 20-25, Bertrand et al.); thus, the same basis and rationale for claim rejection as applied to claims 2-8 above are applied to claims 10-16.

19. As per claim 18, the same basis and rationale for claim rejection as applied to claims 2 and 17 above are applied to claim 18.

20. As per claim 19, the same basis and rationale for claim rejection as applied to claims 4 and 17 above are applied to claim 19.

21. As per claim 20, the same basis and rationale for claim rejection as applied to claims 2, 6, and 17-18 above are applied to claim 20.

***Conclusion***

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to a computer-implemented method for an IP address allocation:

U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0026230 to Ibanez et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,708,034 to Sen et al.

U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0017856 to Asokan et al.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,618,592 to Vilander et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Liou whose telephone number is 571-272-8136. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM ~ 5:00PM Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on 571-272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.




Art Unit: 2672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jonathan Liou

08/03/2005

  
RICKY NGO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
8/8/05